REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's Final Office Action of April 10, 2007 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that the flat panel display displays images in its image viewing area and that the images are received by the flat panel display from an external computer device connected to an image input of the printing and display device, where the image input is arranged in the casing of the printing and display device. Support for this amendment can be found in the section entitled Flat Panel Display Device with Integrated Printer at pages 20-25 of the present specification;

dependent claim 2 is amended to conform with amended claim 1; and dependent claims 3-31 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not add any new matter to the present application, nor any new issues to the prosecution of the present application.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-31 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by any one or more of previously cited Kashiwa, Morgavi, Minemoto, Steinfeld and Rylander, for at least the following reasons.

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that the pending claim language is being broadly interpreted in the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been further amended, as discussed above, to clarify that the printer is arranged within an <u>image viewing</u> area of the flat panel display, not merely within the vicinity of the display as interpreted by the Examiner, and that the images are received from an external computer device connected to an image input which is arranged in the casing of the claimed printing and display device, not merely from an integral computer processor as interpreted by the Examiner.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and therefore claims 2-31 dependent therefrom, is clearly distinguished from the disclosures of Kashiwa, Morgavi, Minemoto, Steinfeld and Rylander for at least the reasons discussed by the Applicant in the Reply to the previous Office Action,

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

Kia Silverbrook

lus?

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762